

## REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated March 16, 2006. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

### Status of the Claims

Claims 2, 4 and 39-41 are under consideration in this application. Claim 1 is being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2 and 4 are being amended, as set forth in the above marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim applicants' invention. New claims 39-41 are being added to recite other features described in the specification.

The Title of the disclosure and the claims are being amended to correct formal errors and/or to better recite or describe the features of the present invention as claimed. All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

### Formality Rejection

The Title of the Invention was objected to for being non-descriptive. As indicated, the Title is being amended as required by the Examiner. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding informality rejection is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

### Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,266,119 B1 to Takahashi et al. (hereinafter "Takahashi"). This rejection has been carefully considered, but is most respectfully traversed, as more fully discussed below.

The display device of the invention (the elected embodiment depicted in Fig. 7; pp. 34-36), as now recited in claim 2, comprises: a display panel PNL, another member (e.g., a frame UFM) different from the display panel PNL which is mounted on a back surface of the display panel PNL, a first board CNTS mounted with a connector CNT which allows inputting of video data, and a second board TCNS mounted with a display control circuit TCON which is connected to the connector CNT (e.g., via the male and female connectors

cnt5 in Fig. 7B; claim 40). The first board CNTS and the second board TCNS are physically separated from each other. The second board TCNS is arranged to be brought into contact with a back surface of a region of the display panel PNL except for a display portion, and the first board CNTS is arranged to be brought into contact with a back surface of the another member UFM.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of cited prior art references discloses, teaches or suggests applying such a “second board TCNS mounted with a display control circuit TCON which is connected to the connector CNT mounted on the first board CNTS” as the present invention.

In contrast, the alleged second board FCC 39 in Takahashi (p. 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> & last paragraphs of the outstanding Office Action) is merely connected between the first/driver board PCB 36 and a control circuit (not shown) (Fig. 9; col. 8, lines 59-60). Takahashi does not specify the control circuit as any “display” control circuit. Even if it were a “display” control circuit, Takahashi does not describe that the control circuit is mounted on the alleged second board FCC 39. In fact, Takahashi's driver device 34 is formed on the display panel surface (Fig. 5) and then electrically (but not physically) connected to the driver board 36 (col. 4, lines 48-50), rather than being “mounted” on the driver board 36 or any other boards. Therefore, Takahashi does not provide a “second board TCNS mounted with a display control circuit TCON which is connected to the connector CNT mounted on the first board CNTS” as the present invention.

Applicants contend that Takahashi fails to teach or disclose each and every feature of the present invention as recited in at least independent claim 2. As such, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the rejections raised in the Office Action. The withdrawal of the outstanding prior art rejections is in order, and is respectfully solicited.

### Conclusion


In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicant respectfully contends that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance

of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

**August 14, 2006**

SPF/JCM/JT